



MINUTES OF SPECIFICATION COMMITTEE MEETING

April 11, 2002

Members Present:	John Adam, Director Tom Reis, Chair Jim Berger Steve Gent Larry Jesse Bruce Kuehl Doug McDonald Keith Norris Gary Novey Dan Ohman	Statewide Operations Bureau Specifications Section Office of Materials Office of Traffic and Safety Office of Local Systems District 6 Marshalltown RCE District 2 Materials Office of Bridges and Structures Office of Design
Members Not Present:	Roger Bierbaum John Smythe	Office of Contracts Office of Construction
From FHWA:	none	
Others Present:	Donna Buchwald, Secretary Tom Jacobson Kevin Jones Ed Kasper Will Stien	Specifications Section Office of Construction Office of Materials Office of Contracts Office of Design

Tom Reis, the Specifications Engineer, opened the meeting. The following items were discussed in accordance with the April 2, 2002, agenda:

1. CAST Update

a. Values

No change from previous meeting.

b. Progress Reports

1. Project Supervision: John Smythe

No change from previous meeting.

2. Pre-letting: Francis Todey/Tom Reis

Shoulder Aggregate:

A Supplemental Specification for Furnish and Apply Granular Shoulder Material was completed for the March letting. There were 18 shoulder aggregate projects

in the March letting. All of these projects were from Districts 2 and 6. There other Districts indicated an interest in letting shoulder aggregate projects, but funding was a concern for them.

On-Call Contracting - Patching:

Supplemental Specifications for On-Call Contracting - Patching have been completed and the on-call patching quotes will be received in the April letting. Two quotes will be received for each District, one for 2 lane primary routes and one for Interstate routes or multiple lane Primary. After these quotes are received, the Districts can begin offering patching projects to the low bidders. The Office of Contracts is developing a spreadsheet the Districts will use to determine the low bidder for each patching work package they offer. When a contractor accepts the work a simple contract will be executed.

There have been requests for development of Supplemental Specifications for On-Call Contracting - Lighting, Signing, Guardrail to name a few. Although there are other areas to be developed, the Pre-letting group believes that focus should be on follow-up to the Patching Supplemental Specification; to monitor that it is working the way it was intended.

3. Materials and Audits: Kevin Jones

QAQC - Structures is the only area that this group has not finished. There have been discussions with the industry on this topic. The Materials and Audits group hopes to have something ready for trial this fall.

4. Plan Improvement Team: Roger Gould/Tom Reis

The Specification Section changed the Method of Measurement for the pipe items to plan quantity as requested by the Plan Improvement Team. The Specification Section will attempt to change the pavement items for the October 29, 2002, letting.

5. Technology and Innovation: Tom Reis

No change from previous meeting.

6. Training: John Smythe

The Office of Construction developed a two day training session on Basic Construction Administration for each District's Maintenance personnel. This training was completed earlier this week.

c. Work Plan, Milestones, and Time Line

No change from previous meeting.

d. Communication

1. Industry

The Office of Construction has been presenting the C.A.S.T. changes to the industries and has not received any complaints.

2. Employees

The Office of Construction presented the C.A.S.T. changes to the field office employees at their Winter Training sections.

3. Counties & cities

e. Miscellaneous

2. Article 2102.06, Borrow

The Statewide Operations Bureau Director requested a discussion of the meaning of "mandatory borrow" which keeps coming up due to the situation at Eddyville where the low bidder proposed, in a value engineering proposal, a different borrow source. The value-engineering proposal was accepted and millions of dollars are being saved as a result. The Contractor's competitors, those who were not low bidders, continue to maintain that since mandatory borrow was noted on the plans, it couldn't and shouldn't be allowed through value engineering either. Is there a better way to define the meaning? In a related issue, a short discussion is requested on pre-bid meeting, whether or not they should be mandatory.

Mandatory borrows are not allowed on Federal-Aid projects (NHS and NHSX) unless a Public Interest Finding is submitted and approved to show that there is a cost savings. Value Engineering proposals are not always accepted and the contractors should not plan on them being accepted. The Specification Committee supported the current specification requirements pertaining to mandatory borrows.

Mandatory pre-bid meetings was not supported by the Specification Committee because they would eliminate the ability for contractors to request bidding documents up to noon the day before the letting. If a potential bidder could not make it to a mandatory pre-bid meeting for reasons beyond their control, ie bad weather, accident, flat tire, then they would not be able to bid.

3. Article 1102.18, C, Positive TSB Effort Documentation.

The Office of Contracts requested an addition to Article 1102.18, C, that will also provide for documentation on projects with established TSB goals.

Submitted by: Roger Bierbaum

Office: Contracts

Date: March 13, 2002

Proposed Effective Date: October 29, 2002

Article No.: 1102.18C

SS No.:

Other:

Change (Redline/Strikeout):

Add the following paragraph:

On proposals where a specific TSB goal has been established, the contractor will be required to submit with the bid, the TSB form provided by the contracting authority to document the TSB participation that will be attained. The contracting authority shall determine if the bidder has made adequate good faith effort to meet the established goal. Bidders who fail to make such good faith effort may have their bid rejected on the basis of being non-responsive for meeting the established TSB goal.

Reason for revision: The Office of Contracts requests this addition to Article 1102.18 (TSB participation). For the most part the existing specification requires contractors to make positive efforts to utilize TSB's and to document those efforts. Recently we noticed that the specification does not provide for projects with established TSB goals. The changes requested will address that.

County or City Input Needed ☐

County or City Comments:

No industry input needed ☐

Industry notified ☐

Industry Concurrence ☐

Industry Comments:

Specification Section Use Only:

Specification Section Recommended Language:

Add as the second paragraph:

On proposals where a specific TSB goal has been established, the Contractor will be required to submit the TSB form with their bid. The TSB form will be provided by the Contracting Authority and used to document the TSB participation that shall be attained. The Contracting Authority will determine if the bidder has made adequate Good Faith Effort to meet the established goal. Bidders who fail to make such Good Faith Effort may have their bid rejected on the basis of being non-responsive to meeting the established TSB goal.

Specification Section Comments:

Final Approved Text: Specification Section recommended language.

Comments: No discussion. Rules Committee approval required.

Specification Committee Action:

Deferred: ☐ **Not Approved:** ☐ **Approved Date:** 4-11-02 **Effective Date:** 10-29-02 or later.

4. Article 2506.06, Placement of Mortar as Culvert Backfill

The Office of Materials requested a change to Article 2506.06 that will eliminate a discrepancy in stating the gradation requirements for granular backfill.

Submitted by: K. Jones

Office: Materials

Date: 12/07/01

Proposed Effective Date: Oct, 2002

Article No.: 2506.06

SS No.:

Other:

Change (Redline/Strikeout): Change the first sentence of the 3^d paragraph in 2506.06- Granular Backfill, meeting the requirements of Section 4133 **2506.06G**, . . .

Reason for revision: The specifications for granular backfill under flowable mortar (2506.02G, 2506.06) appear to have a conflict when stating gradation requirements. Article 2506.02G references the gradation under 4110 and 4121. Article 2506.06 references 4133 (with a less drainable gradation). MQRG proposed changing the specification to eliminate this discrepancy by putting a reference in Article 2506.06 to the materials article (2506.02G) and eliminating the reference to 4133. this will specify the gradation requirement that is desired.

County or City Input Needed X

County or City Comments:

No industry input needed X

Industry notified ☐

Industry Concurrence ☐

Industry Comments:

Specification Section Use Only:

Specification Section Recommended Language:

Replace "Section 4133" with "Article 2506.06, G," in the first sentence of the third paragraph.

Specification Section Comments:

Final Approved Text:

Replace "Section 4133" with "Article 2506.02, G," in the first sentence of the third paragraph.

Comments: None.

Specification Committee Action:

Deferred: ☐ **Not Approved:** ☐ **Approved Date:** 4-11-02 **Effective Date:** 10-29-02

5. Article 2513.03, A, Precast Concrete (Concrete Barrier)

The Office of Materials requested a revision to Article 2513.03 that is intended to increase the entrained air content subsequently reducing the amount of scaling due to freeze and thaw degradation.

Submitted by: T. Hanson

Office: Materials

Date: 03/07/02

Proposed Effective Date: Oct, 2002

Article No.: 2513.03 A.

SS No.:

Other:

Change (Redline/Strikeout): Change last sentence, Second Paragraph

The air content of fresh, unvibrated concrete shall be ~~6.5%~~ **7.0%**, as a target value, with a maximum variation of ~~+/- 1.0%~~ **plus 1.5% and minus 1.0%**.

Reason for revision: Request from Roger Boulet and agreed upon by DMS's. There have been some recent precast units that have had sever scaling after one winter. Cores were obtained and it was found the air content was approximately 3%, thereby causing freeze thaw damage. It was noted the units were subjected to heavy vibration to cast the specimens. Increasing the air content will give an extra insurance for loss during consolidation.

County or City Input Needed X

County or City Comments:

No industry input needed X

Industry notified ☐

Industry Concurrence ☐

Industry Comments:

Specification Section Use Only:

Specification Section Recommended Language:

Replace the last paragraph:

The air content of fresh, unvibrated concrete shall be ~~6.5%~~ **7.0%**, as a target value, with a maximum variation of ~~+/- 1.0%~~ **plus 1.5% or minus 1.0%**.

Specification Section Comments:

Final Approved Text: Specification Section recommended language.

Comments: The Specification Committee discussed several methods for testing precast concrete, but determined that at this time they would be destructive, expensive, or not within the needed time frame. The Office of Materials is looking at an admixture that will allow better flow of the wet concrete allowing better fill-in of the decorative relief without over vibration, but will obtain the required strength. The Office of Materials is also reviewing self-compacting concrete.

Specification Committee Action:

Deferred: ☐ **Not Approved:** ☐ **Approved Date:** 4-11-02 **Effective Date:** 10-29-02

6. Article 2527.03, I, 2, Groove Depth (Surface Prep for Profiled Marking Tapes)

The Office of Traffic and Safety requested a change to Article 2527.03 that will increase groove depth for profiled marking tape thus aiding in the wet retroreflective visibility and decrease the susceptibility to snowplow damage.

Submitted by: Kurtis Younkin

Office: Traffic and Safety

Date: 3/22/02

Proposed Effective Date: ASAP

Article No.: 2527.03 I. 2

SS No.:

Other:

Change (Redline/Strikeout): Existing text: 0.065 inches +- 0.020 inches (1.6 mm +- 0.5 mm).
New text: 0.080 inches +- 0.010 inches (2.0 mm +- 0.2 mm)

Reason for revision: There is a new wet reflective tape available. A deeper groove helps to better protect the features that make the tape wet reflective from snow plow damage.

County or City Input Needed ☐

County or City Comments:

No industry input needed ☐

Industry notified ☐

Industry Concurrence ☐

Industry Comments:

Specification Section Use Only:

Specification Section Recommended Language:

Replace entire article:

0.065 inches ± 0.020 inches (1.6 mm ± 0.5 mm) 0.080 inches ± 0.010 inches (2.0 mm ± 0.2 mm)

Specification Section Comments:

Final Approved Text: Specification Section recommended language.

Comments: The current specification leaves the top of the preformed polymer marking tape above the groove. The new groove depth requirement for the wet reflective tape will put the top of the wet reflective tape, as well as the performed polymer marking tape, flush with the pavement surface. This will help protect both tapes from snow plows.

Specification Committee Action:

Deferred: ☐ **Not Approved:** ☐ **Approved Date:** 4-11-02 **Effective Date:** 10-29-02